Development of Cashewnut Cultivation

*Q.—258. Sri J. NARAYANAPPA (Mulbagal).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) the total amount provided by the Government of India and the State Government towards development of cashewnut cultivation in the State since 1961 (yearwise information may be given);

(b) out of the above, the amount distributed to the cultivators of cashewnuts;

(c) the amount that has lapsed and the *reasons therefor;

*the following reasons are attributed for the lapse of the amount provided :—

1. In certain cases no demand for such loans.
2. In certain cases loanees who had taken the first instalment had not spend the amount for which it was sanctioned and as such the 2nd instalment was not sanctioned.

(d) the number of applications received by them from the ryots for grant of loans for the development of cashewnut cultivation during the above period;

(e) out of them, the number of spplications in respect of which loans have been sanctioned;

(f) the number of applications that are pending together with the *reasons for such pendency (districtwise information may be furnished)?

*Reasons of pendency :—

1. For want of allotment
2. Applications were received after the session.
3. Pending investigation.

A.—Sri G. NARAYANA GOWDA (Minister for Agriculture).—

(a) *Year*		*Amount provided*
1961-62	...	Rs. 1,29,570
1962-63	...	Rs. 2,09,260
1963 64	...	Rs. 51,125
1964-65	...	Rs. 83,000

The entire loan amunt is provided by the Government of India.

(SRI G. NARAYANA GOWDA)

(b) *Year*		*Amount distributed to cultivators.*
1961-62	...	Rs. 1,23,415
1962-63	...	Rs. 1,76,950
1963-64	...	Rs. 43,784
1964-65	...	Rs. 68,775
(c) 1961-62	...	Rs. 6,155
1962-63	...	Rs. 32,310
1963-64	...	Rs. 7,341
1964-65	...	Rs. 14,225

(d) *District.*

	Applications received.			
	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65
1	2	3	4	5
1. Chickmagalur	9	—	—	—
2. Chitradurga	—	11	—	—
3. Shimoga	6	1	2	15
4. Kolar	—	37	—	—
5. N. Kanara	211	205	73	71
6. S. Kanara	219	128	70	14
7. Belgaum	—	9	—	12
8. Hasan	—	3	—	11
9. Mysore	—	11	—	—
10. Dharwar	—	17	4	9
11. Tumkur	11	31	8	10
12. Mandya	—	8	—	—

(e) *District*

	Applications Sanctioned.			
	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65
1. Chickmagalur	8	—	—	—
2. Chitradurga	—	11	—	—
3. Shimoga	1	1	2	9
4. Kolar	—	29	—	—
5. N. Kanara	147	156	28	45
6. S. Kanara	154	72	41	9
7. Belgaum	—	9	—	11
8. Hassan	—	3	—	3
9. Mysore	—	10	—	—
10. Dharwar	—	17	4	3
11. Tumkur	7	26	5	4
12. Mandya	—	7	—	—

(*f*) *District* — *Applications pending:*

	1961-62	1962-63	1963-64	1964-65
1. Chikmagalur	—	—	—	—
2. Chitradurga	—	—	—	—
3. Shimoga	5	—	—	6
4. Kolar	—	8	—	—
5. N. Kanara	—	—	—	—
6. S. Kanara	—	—	—	5
7. Belgaum	—	—	—	1
8. Hassan	—	—	—	1
9. Mysore	—	—	—	1
10. Dharwar	—	—	—	2
11. Tumkur	—	—	—	6
12. Mandya	—	—	—	—

Price Control Order.

*Q.—266. Sri G. V. GOWDA (Palya).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) the compelling reasons that prompted the Government to repeal the price control Order on foodgrains ;

(*b*) the consequences of doing away with the price control Order ?

A.—Sri B. D. JATTI (Minister for Food).—

(*a*) The maximum selling prices for rice were fixed in November 1964, as the prices in the market were rising and it was considered necessary and desirable to peg the prices at some specific point so that there might be some parity between the prices of foodgrains in the open market and the prices at which foodgrains were being sold through fair price shops. It was later considered necessary to isolate the surplus and deficit districts so that paddy/jowar could be procured under the Levy Orders and restrictions were accordingly imposed subsequently on the inter district movement of foodgrains. While Government were able to procure sizeable quantities of foodgrains and the prices of such foodgrains as were available in the open market continued to remain within the prescribed maximum it was found that availability of foodgrains in open market got reduced considerably. The position was therefore reviewed in May 1965. In order to ensure that the stocks, particularly from the surplus Districts moved to the deficit districts and stocks became available in the market though at relatively